

**CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**  
**Serial No: 10/524,177**  
**Office Action dated: 04/12/06**  
**Response dated: June 12, 2006**

**PATENT**  
**PU020378**

**Remarks/Arguments**

The Office Action mailed April 12, 2006 has been reviewed and carefully considered.

Claims 1, 4 8 and 11 have been amended. Claims 1-14 remain now pending in this application.

Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended the specification at page 3, lines 10-12 to correct a minor typographical error. In particular, in the brief description of drawings, Figure "3" was inadvertently identified as Figure "2". No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Claims 1, 4, 8, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 8 and 11 to correct the antecedent basis issues raised by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,920,814 to Sawyer et al. In asserting this rejection, the Examiner has indicated that Applicants' claimed steps of receiving a request for access and querying at least one serving node in the network are inherent steps. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner on the inherency of these steps. There is no suggestion or indication that a received request for access is "inherently" from a terminal that has previously registered with the network. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Sawyer et al. has been cited for disclosing the sending of an identification response from a register to the at least one serving node to identify the mobile wireless terminal. In citing this rejection, the Examiner has pointed to Col. 2, lines 9-14 and 20-23 where it is clearly indicated that identity is established by using temporary mobile station identity (TMSI) information only.

Independent Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to more clearly recite the subject matter of the present principles. In particular, the use of permanent identity information stored in the register to match a mobile wireless terminal identity using only its temporary identity in the network. A thorough review of Sawyer et al. reveals that there is no mention or even remote suggestion of using this temporary (e.g., TMSI) information to match to permanent information stored in a register, such as the home location register such as claimed by the present principles.

From the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that Sawyer et al. does anticipate or even remotely suggest the claimed subject matter of the present principles. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawyer et al., in view of Rautila et al. (USP 6,853,851). Rautila et al. fails to provide any teachings that would overcome the shortcomings of the Sawyer et al. patent as discussed above in connection with the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claim 1. In view of the above-identified distinctions between the claimed subject matter of the present principles and Sawyer et al., the combination of Sawyer et al. and Rautila et al. fail for at least the reasons cited above. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully solicited.

Claims 4-5 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawyer et al., in view of Rautila et al. and in further view of Quick Jr. et al. (US 2003/0112976). The Quick Jr. patent, like that of Rautila et al, fails to overcome the shortcomings of the Sawyer et al. patent. In view of the above-identified distinctions between the claimed subject matter of the present principles and Sawyer et al., the combination of Sawyer et al. with Quick Jr. et al. and Rautila et al fail for at least the reasons cited above. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully solicited.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawyer et al., in view of Rautila et al. and in further view of Warsta (USP 5,713,073). The Warsta patent, like that of Rautila et al, fail to overcome the shortcoming of Sawyer et al. In view of the above-identified distinctions between the claimed subject matter of the present principles and Sawyer et al., the combination of Sawyer et al. with Warsta and Rautila et al fail for at least the reasons cited above. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully solicited.

Claims 7 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawyer et al. in view of Warsta. In view of the above-identified distinctions between the claimed subject matter of the present principles and Sawyer et al., any combination of Sawyer et al. with the teachings of Warsta fail for at least the reasons cited above. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully solicited.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawyer et al., in view of Rautila et al. and in further view of Quick Jr. et al. and Warsta. In view of the above-identified distinctions between the claimed subject matter of the present principles and Sawyer et al., any combination of Sawyer et al. with the teachings of Rautila et al. and

**CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**  
**Serial No: 10/524,177**  
**Office Action dated: 04/12/06**  
**Response dated: June 12, 2006**

**PATENT**  
**PU020378**

Warsta fail for at least the reasons cited above. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully solicited.

Applicants have submitted with this response an Information Disclosure Statement (PTO Form 1449 and an accompanying certification under 37 C.F.R. 1.97) disclosing a reference cited in a related European application by applicants' French patent agent. This reference entitled "Integration of Security Aspects in UMTS and BRAN" authored by Christoph Stepping, discloses some security features in UMTS systems. However, there is nothing in this reference that discloses "querying the serving node to recognize a mobile terminal in accordance with temporary identity contained in the access request". In addition, there is no mention or suggestion of the use of temporary information to relate to permanent information stored in the register.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the claims set forth in the Office Action of April 12, 2006 be withdrawn, that pending claims 1-14 be allowed, and that the case proceed to early issuance of Letters Patent in due course.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicants' representatives Deposit Account No. **07-0832**

RBL:pdf

Thomson Licensing Inc.  
Patent Operations  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

June 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

SHAILY VERMA ET AL.

By:

Robert B. Levy, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 28,234  
(609) 734-6820

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any document referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on the date indicated below:

Date

June 12, 2006

Patricia M. Fedorowycz  
Patricia M. Fedorowycz